

REMARKS

The Examiner's comments together with the cited references have been carefully studied. Favorable reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim 33 was previously pending in the application. Claim 33 has been rejected. Claim 33 herewith is amended. New Claims 34 to 38 have been added. Claims presently active are, therefore, claims 33 to 38. Favorable reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested

Support for new claims 34 to 38 are to be found in the original claims of the parent application. Also, support for stating that a single blocked developing is present can be found in the original claim in which a single PUG is present. The Examiner is also directed to the use of the singular "a" in the following places: page 4, line 13; page 4, line 27; page 9, line 29, etc.

Claim 33 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraph. The Examiner states that there is no support for the language "wherein the compound comprises only a single blocked developing agent." Applicants respectfully submit that the claim has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's comments in the Office Action. The language in question has been deleted and replaced by language having the above-indicated support. This amendment is believed to conform the claims to the requirements of the rules.

Relying on 35 U.S.C. §102(b), the Examiner rejected claim 33 as being anticipated by Irving et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection, and request reconsideration. Applicants respectfully submit that a rejection for lack of novelty under Section 102(b) requires that the invention must be identically disclosed or described in the reference. Applicants respectfully submit that important and material limitations of their invention as claimed are not disclosed in the reference. Applicants respectfully submit that Irving et al. do not disclose, teach, or suggest the presently claimed compound in which a single developing agent is present and released in contrast to compound D-28 in column 41 of Irving et al. With respect to the compound shown on page 4 of the office action, the "Me" group

is not an electron withdrawing group and does not fall within any of the permissible groups recited for W.

In addition, new claims 34 to 38 now require that when W is a divalent electron withdrawing group, it is selected from the group consisting of $-\text{SO}_2\text{R}_{13}$, $-\text{OSO}_2\text{R}_{13}$, $-\text{NR}_{13}(\text{SO}_2\text{R}_{14})$, $-\text{CO}_2\text{R}_{13}$, $-\text{COR}_{13}$, $-\text{NR}_{13}(\text{COR}_{14})$, wherein R_{13} and R_{14} are independently substituted or unsubstituted alkyl, aryl, or heterocyclic group having 1 to 8 carbon atoms. Compound D-28 of Irving et al. does not have 1-8 carbon atoms for R_{13} and hence does not meet the limitation of those claims for that reason.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claim 33 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Irving et al.

Statement of Common Ownership

The subject matter of the cited co-pending Application No. 09/475,510 and the claimed invention of the present application No. 09/871,921 were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the assignee Eastman Kodak.

Based on this statement, this rejection is believed obviated, as indicated by the Examiner.

In view thereof, it follows that the subject matter of the claims would not have been obvious in view of Irving et al. at the time the invention was made.

Applicants have reviewed the prior art made of record and believe that singly or in any suitable combination, they do not render Applicants' claimed invention unpatentable.

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendment, the claims are now believed allowable and such favorable action is courteously solicited.

Should the Examiner consider that additional amendments are necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the favor is requested of a telephone call to the undersigned counsel for the purpose of discussing such amendments.

Respectfully submitted,



Chris P. Konkol
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 30,721

CPK:clb
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: (585) 722-0452
Facsimile: (585) 477-1148